

THE PREFACE OF THE *BIBLIOTHECA* OF PHOTIUS: TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND COMMENTARY*

WARREN T. TREADGOLD

IF scholars still disagree sharply about when, why, and how Photius composed the collection of descriptions of books that forms his *Bibliotheca*, this is not because the author himself gives no explanation of his work. Among Photius' several explanatory passages, the longest and most informative is his preface, addressed, like the whole composition, to his brother Tarasius.¹ Yet this preface has left room for controversy for three reasons. First, some scholars have considered it to be partly or entirely a literary fiction, or at least to belong to a version of the *Bibliotheca* earlier than the one we possess.² Second, the meaning of some parts of the preface is obscure, either because Photius was striving for stylistic elegance, or because he was assuming his brother had knowledge of circumstances of which we do not. Third, the text of the preface, unlike that of most of the *Bibliotheca*, is in bad condition, with several uncertain readings and one passage in fragments.

Of the two primary manuscripts of the *Bibliotheca*, one, Marcianus Graecus 451 (M),

* I would like to thank Professor Ihor Ševčenko of Harvard University for his help and advice, not only on this article but on my entire dissertation. I would also like to thank Professor Nicolas Oikonomides of the University of Montreal for his advice on the text and translation, and Professor Carmine Coppola of the University of Salerno for sending me an offprint of his article.

¹ For other explanatory passages, see Photius, *Bibliotheca*, ed. and trans. R. Henry (Paris, 1959–74), 1 (title, which should be placed at 1a.1), 108b.28–38, 131b.19–20; and ed. I. Bekker (Berlin, 1824–25), 495b.35–41, 545.13–22 (a postface) (hereafter, *Bibliotheca*, with references as far as 474a.20 to Henry and afterward to Bekker, unless otherwise noted).

² F. Halkin, "La date de composition de la *Bibliothèque* remise en question," *AnalBoll*, 81 (1963), 414–17; and C. Mango, "The Availability of Books in the Byzantine Empire, A.D. 750–850," in *Byzantine Books and Bookmen: A Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium* (Washington, D.C., 1975), 42.

has lost its first folio altogether, and with it the entire preface.³ The only primary witness for the text of the preface is, therefore, Marcianus Graecus 450 (A), a manuscript of the tenth century.⁴ Though A's readings are generally reliable, its first folio has become worn and dirty and, in particular, is missing its upper right-hand corner with parts of eight lines of the text (fig. 1). Some of the worn letters have been overwritten by a later hand (A*), and the missing corner has been replaced by a patch, a palimpsest of some other work, which is glued over the front of the original page, making it very difficult to read about four of the remaining letters of each line. This corner had already been lost and patched by the fifteenth century, before three apographs were made from A: X (Harleianus gr. 5591, 5592, and 5593), T (Paris, Bibl. Nat. suppl. gr. 471), and O (Vat. gr. 1189).⁵

The first editor of the *Bibliotheca*, David Hoeschel, edited the preface only from the apographs.⁶ Because the first folio of A is so difficult to read, subsequent editors evidently used Hoeschel's text as a guide to A, as indeed I have done myself. The only published attempt to reconstruct the fragmentary passage in Greek seems to be that of Jean and David Berthelin, who reprinted Hoeschel's edition in 1653.⁷ Having no access to A,

³ See E. Martini, *Textgeschichte der Bibliothek des Patriarchen Photios von Konstantinopel*, I. *Die Handschriften, Ausgaben, und Übertragungen*, AbhLeipzig, Phil.-hist.Kl., 28,6 (1911), 17.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 7; cf. A. Diller, "Photius' *Bibliotheca* in Byzantine Literature," *DOP*, 16 (1962), 389.

⁵ Martini, *op. cit.*, 29–31, 77, 35, 83, 39, and 89.

⁶ Ed. Hoeschel (Augsburg, 1601); Martini, *op. cit.*, 118; but cf. T. Hägg, review of Henry's edition, in *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 228 (1976), 49 note 15.

⁷ See *Bibliotheca*, apparatus to 1. Bekker correctly attributes the reconstruction to the edition of the Berthelins (Rouen, 1653), while Henry incorrectly attributes it to Hoeschel.



1. Marcianus Graecus 450 (A), fol. 1r, The Preface

they made a reconstruction that, as Bekker observed, "completes neither the sense nor the space."⁸ In his own edition, the latter simply printed a number of points equal to his estimate of the number of letters missing from A. Konrat Ziegler, when he reedited the preface, gave no reconstruction in Greek but stated the sense of the passage in German, on the basis of a subsequent quotation in the *Bibliotheca* that plainly served as Photius' model for this part of his preface.⁹ However, the most recent editor of the *Bibliotheca*, René Henry, who made no changes in Bekker's text, expressed the opinion that "every attempt to find a sense for this fragmentary passage is in vain."¹⁰ In his review of Henry's edition, Hägg seemed to share this opinion, though he supplied new estimates of the gaps and new readings of some of the letters covered by the patch.¹¹ Most recently, Carmine Coppola has reexamined the text, again without attempting to reconstruct the gaps.¹²

⁸ See *Bibliotheca*, apparatus to 1, ed. Bekker.

⁹ *RE*, 20 (1941), col. 686.

¹⁰ *Bibliotheca*, note to 1, ed. Henry.

¹¹ Hägg. *op. cit.*, 48–50.

¹² "Contributo alla restituzione del testo della lettera a Tarasio, proemiale della 'Biblioteca' di Fozio," *RBSN*, 12–13 (1975–76), 129–53.

In this article, I try to give the readings of A as completely as possible, even when they must be indicated to be uncertain. Though I saw the original in Venice at an early stage of my work, the readings I give here derive principally from those of Hägg and Coppola and from my own inspection of photographs, particularly the old and clear one published by Martini which is reproduced here.¹³ Beyond this, I have made tentative reconstructions of the missing portions of the text on the basis of parallels elsewhere in the *Bibliotheca* and in Photius' other works. The line numbers given are those of A. Restored letters are enclosed in square brackets, interpolated letters in braces. Vertical lines indicate the beginning of the patch. A point under a letter indicates that its reading is uncertain in A and uncorroborated by the apographs. My translation and commentary are based on a dissertation on the whole *Bibliotheca* which I recently completed for Harvard University and hope to publish in the near future.

¹³ Martini, *op. cit.*, pl. 1. From this photograph, with strong light and magnification, I believe I can confirm and supplement the readings of Hägg for the letters concealed by the patch. Of course, all such readings will be superseded when and if the patch is removed.

col. 1 {Φωτίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κων-
σταντινουπόλεως καὶ οἴκου-
μενικοῦ πατριάρχου.}
Φώτιος ἡγαπημένῳ ἀδελ-
5 φῶ Ταρασίῳ ἐν Κυρίῳ χαίρειν.
Ἐπειδὴ τῷ τε κοινῷ τῆς πρεσβεί-
ας καὶ τῇ βασιλείῳ ψήφῳ πρεσ-
βεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐπ' Ἀσσυρίους αἰρεθέν-
τας ἤτησας τὰς ὑποθέσεις ἐ-
10 κείνων τῶν βιβλίων, οἷς μὴ παρέτυ-
χες ἀναγινωσκομένοις, γραφῆναι
σοι, ἀδελφῶν φίλτατέ μοι, Ταράσιε,
ἵν'
ἔχοις ἅμα μὲν τῆς διαλεύξεως
ἣν βαρέως φέρεις παραμύθιον,
15 ἅμα δὲ καὶ ὧν οὕτω εἰς ἀκοὰς ἡμῶν
ἀνέγνως εἰ καὶ διατυπωτικὴν τι-
να καὶ κοινοτέραν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν
(ταῦτα δὲ ἐστὶ πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ μέρει

col. {Of Photius, Archbishop of Constanti-
1 nople and Ecumenical Patriarch.}

Photius to his beloved brother
Tarasius, greeting in the Lord.

When we were chosen by the mem-
bers of the embassy and by imperial
appointment to go on an embassy to the
Assyrians, you asked us to write down
for you summaries of those books that
had been read when you were not present,
my dearest brother Tarasius, so that you
might have some consolation for the
separation that you bear unwillingly,
and also the knowledge, even if some-
what impressionistic and rather general,
of those books that you have not yet
read in our hearing. These are the fif-
teenth part plus one short of three
hundred and no more [i.e., 279], for that

col. 1, 8. Ἀσσυρίους edd.: ἄσσυρίους A.

- τῶν τριακοσίων ἐφ' ἐνὶ καὶ οὐ πλέον
 20 ἀπολείποντα, τοσαῦτα γάρ, οἶμαι,
 τῆς σῆς οὐ τυχόντα παρουσίας ἀνα-
 γνωσθῆναι συνέπεσεν), ὅψε μὲν ἱ-
 σως τοῦ σοῦ διαπύρου πόθου καὶ τῆς
 25 θερμῆς αἰτήσεως, θᾶττον δὲ ἢ ὅσον
 ἂν τις ἄλλος ἐλπίσειε, τυχόντες ὑ-
 πογραφέως, ὅσας αὐτῶν ἡ μνήμη
 διέσωλε, τὸν σὸν ὥσπερ ἀφοσιούμε-
 νοι πόθον καὶ τὴν ἀξίωσιν ἐκδε-
 δώκαμεν.
 Οὕτω δὲ τάξεως αἱ ὑπο-
 30 θέσεις ἐπιλήφονται, ὡς ἂν ἐκάστην
 αὐτῶν ἡ μνήμη προβάλοι, οὐ χαλε-
 πὸν ὃν καὶ εἴ τις ἔλοιτο ἰδίᾳ μὲν τού-
 των ὅσα τῆς ἱστορίας ἐστίν, ἰδίᾳ δὲ
 ὅσα
 πρὸς ἄλλον καὶ ἄλλον σκοπὸν
 col. 2 ἀναφ[έρει] [αἱ πάντα διελεῖν κατ']
 εἶδος, [μετὰ [πολλῆς (?) φιλοπονίας,]
 ἀλλὰ περὶ [τῆς [καὶ περιέργου φιλο-]
 τιμίας. Μᾶλλον [δ' ὁ τὸ ἀναμιγμένον]
 5 νομίζων ἀξι[ό] [λογον, [αἰρούμενος (?)]
 δὲ καὶ τὸ ποικίλο[ν, καὶ [ἀνομοιότατα]
 ἐν πολλοῖς πολλαῖς [ἁρμό[ζεται],
 καὶ κόρον οὐκ οἶδε τίκτειν εἰς [ἄκροα-
 [τήν].
 Εἰ δὲ σοί ποτε κατ' αὐτὰ γενο[ι]-
 μένω [τά]
 10 {τά} τεύχη καὶ φιλοπονουμένω τιν[ες]
 τῶν
 ὑποθεσέων ἐλλιπῶς ἢ οὐκ εἰς τὸ ἀ[κρι-
 βὲς δόξουσιν ἀπομνημονεῦσθαι, μη-
 δὲν θαυμάσης. Μίαν μὲν γὰρ ἐκάσ-
 τὴν βίβλον ἀναλεγόμενῳ καὶ τὴν ὑπό-
 15 θεσιν συλλαβεῖν καὶ μνήμη καὶ γραφῇ
 παραδοῦναι οὐκ ἔργον ἐστὶ τῷ βου-
 λομένῳ· ὁμοῦ δὲ πλειόνων, καὶ τότε

is the number, I believe, that happened to be read when you did not happen to be there. Though later, perhaps, than was your burning desire and warm entreaty, nevertheless more quickly than anyone else would have expected, we, finding a secretary, have edited as many of the summaries as our memory preserves, satisfying your desire and claim.

The summaries will be treated in whatever order my memory presents each of them, though it would not be

col. difficult, if someone should choose, [to
 2 distribute all] those of them that are of history in one place and those that relate to one subject or another in other places [according to] their kind, with [much(?) learning,] but excessive [and officious pe]dantry. On the other hand, [one] who considers [mixture] an admirable thing, and [chooses(?)] variation as well, in many places at many times harmo[nizes] even [the most dissimilar things,] and cannot produce boredom in his read[er.]

And if it seems to you, whenever you come upon [the] volumes themselves one by one and study them, that some of the summaries have been recorded inadequately and inexactly, do not be surprised. For it is no trouble for a man who reads through one book by itself to compose its summary and to commit it

24. ὅσον scripsi: ὅσον A: ὅσα edd.
 col. 2, 1. ἀναφέρεται suppl. Hoeschel et Ziegler. πάντα διελεῖν κατ' supplevi.
 2. πολλῆς φιλοπονίας supplevi.
 3. περιττῆς X: περιττ... A: περὶ τῆς TO. καὶ περιέργου φιλοτιμίας supplevi.
 4. δ' ὁ τὸ ἀναμιγμένον supplevi.
 5. ἀξιόλογον suppl. Hägg: ἀξ...λογον A: ἀξι O: ἀξ X: ἐξ T: ἄξιον suppl. Coppola. αἰρούμενος supplevi.
 6. ἀνομοιότατα supplevi.
 7. ἁρμόζεται supplevi: ἁρμ. A: ὁρμό O: om. XT.
 8. ἀκροατήν supplevi: om. TO: μι X.
 9. τὰ supplevi (cf. 10): ταῦτα τὰ suppl. Coppola.
 10. τὰ A* mg. τινὲς τῶν A: τινὰ edd.
 16. οὐκ A: ἀξ... edd.
 17. καὶ τότε A: καὶ τόσου τε Coppola.

- χρόνου μεταξύ διαρρυνέντος, εἰς ἀνά-
μνησιν μετὰ τοῦ ἀκριβοῦς ἐφικέσθαι
20 οὐκ οἶμαι ῥάδιον εἶναι. Ἡμῖν δὲ καὶ
ὅσα ἐπιπολάζει τῶν ἀνεγνωσμένων
καὶ οὐδὲ τὰς σὰς διὰ τὸ πρόχειρον
ἴσως διαπέφυγε μελέτας, οὐδὲ τού-
τοις τὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὁμοίαν ἐξέ-
25 μεθα φροντίδα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ ἐκού-
σιον τὸ ἀκριβὲς αὐτῶν ὑπερώφθη.
Εἰ δέ τι καὶ ἄλλο χρεῖῳδες καὶ τῆς σῆς
αἰτήσεως ἐπὶ πλεόν ταῖς ὑποθέσεσι
συνεισπίπτει, αὐτὸς μᾶλλον συνήσεις.
30 Χρησιμεύσει δέ σοι δηλονότι τὰ
ἐκ-
δεδομένα εἰς τε κεφαλαιώδη μνή-
μην καὶ ἀνάμνησιν τῶν***εἴτε κατὰ
σεαυτὸν ἀναλεξάμενος ἐπῆλθες, καὶ
εἰς ἔτοιμον εὗρεσιν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐπι-
35 ζητουμένων, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς
εὐχερεστέ-
ραν ἀνάληψιν τῶν οὕτω τὴν ἀνάγ-
νωσιν
τῆς σῆς συνέσεως ὑπελθόντων.

to memory and writing if he wishes, but for a man who reads many books together to come to an exact recollection of them, especially when some time passes in the interval, is not, I think, an easy thing. Besides, for our part, with those books that we have read that are common and probably, because of their availability, have not eluded your studies either, we have not taken as much care as with the others; in the case of these exactitude has been deliberately neglected. But if anything else useful and beyond what you requested finds its way in along with the summaries, you will see it better than I.

These materials that we have edited will no doubt be of use to you for your general memory and remembrance of the [books that(?)]; you have gone through in your reading [either with others(?)] or by yourself, and for finding readily what you look for in them, as well as for your easier comprehension of those things that have not yet come to be read by your perceptive self.

32. lac. indicavi, coniciens excidisse e.g. βιβλίων ἃ εἴτε μετ' ἄλλων: τῶν εἴτε A: τῶν εἴ τι Bekker: αὐτῶν εἴ τι Coppola.

COMMENTARY

Col. 1, 4-5: Photius' letters include thirteen others addressed to Tarasius.¹⁴ Moreover, prefaces similar to this one show that Photius wrote three of his other works for particular people: his *Lexicon* for his student Thomas, his *Amphilochia* for his friend Amphilochius of Cyzicus, and his *Against the Manichaeans* in its first edition for the "Manichaean" Berzelis, and in its

second for his friend Arsenius of Hiera.¹⁵ Thus, this preface is not likely to be a literary fiction, especially because Photius addresses a number of passages in the rest of the *Bibliotheca* to Tarasius in the second person.¹⁶

6-17: Photius seems to have borrowed the phrase ἐπ' Ἀσσυρίους from Procopius. Com-

¹⁴ Photius, *Epistolae*, ed. I. Valettas (London, 1864), nos. 12, 13, 14, 142, 143, 220, 223, and 224; ed. PG, 101, nos. 133 and 135 (Professor L.G. Westerink has informed me that the MSS indicate that these were originally letters addressed to Tarasius); and ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Sanctissimi Patriarchae Photii archiepiscopi Constantinopoleos epistolae XIV* (St. Petersburg, 1896), nos. 4, 6, and 8 (nos. 3, 5, and 7 are letters from Tarasius to Photius).

¹⁵ Photius, *Lexicon*, ed. S. A. Naber (Leiden, 1864-65), I, 199-200; cf. *Der Anfang des Lexicons des Photios*, ed. R. Reitzenstein (Leipzig-Berlin, 1907), 1-2. Photius, *Amphilochia*, PG, 101, cols. 45A-48B. Photius, *Adversus Manichaeos*, preface ed. and trans. Ch. Astruc et al., "Les sources grecques pour l'histoire des pauliciens d'Asie mineure," *TM*, 4 (1970), 181-83.

¹⁶ See, besides the passages cited in notes 1 and 21, *Bibliotheca*, 103b.30-32, 145a.30-145b.7, 154a.18-19, 186a.5, 186a.14, 188a.28-29, etc.

παρὲν Ἀσσυρίοις, which Photius quotes in his epitome of Procopius' *Wars*, where it means the land east of the Tigris.¹⁷ Probably Photius' embassy was that of 845 to the Caliph's capital at Samarra, on the east bank of the Tigris in Assyria.¹⁸ In any case, Photius would not have been chosen as an ambassador before 842, when he was in exile as an iconophile,¹⁹ and we would almost certainly know if he had been chosen after 858, when he became patriarch. The "separation" that Photius mentions here is presumably the one that will occur when he leaves on the embassy and Tarasius stays home.

18–22: Photius gives the same number with similar elaboration in his title and postface, though the *Bibliotheca* contains 280 numbered descriptions of books, conventionally called "codices." As J. B. Bury noted, this is probably because "codex" 268 concerns an author, the orator Lycurgus, whom Photius says he did not read.²⁰ That no "codices" were added at a later date is demonstrated by a note in the original table of contents under "codex" 280: "...with which things note, dearest brother, that the things you earnestly requested also come to an end."²¹

22–29: The sense and syntax both imply that it was the editing that was done before anyone else would have expected, not, as some have thought, the finding of the secretary. If Photius included as much as he could remember, this need not mean that he worked

from memory alone, and in fact it is demonstrable that he did not.²² Because Photius evidently produced only one manuscript for Tarasius, I have translated ἐκδεδώκαμεν as "we have edited," not "we have published."

29–31: Note that this passage excludes the idea that Photius presents the books in the order in which he read them. This is further disproved by a number of references in the *Bibliotheca* to books that are only described later on.²³

29–col.2, 8: As Johann Klinkenberg was the first to notice, Photius has modeled this passage on the preface of Pamphila of Epidaurus to her lost collection of historical extracts.²⁴ Photius quotes this preface in "codex" 175: Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα, ὅσα λόγου καὶ μνήμης αὐτῇ ἄξια ἐδόκει, εἰς ὑπομνήματα συμμιγῇ καὶ οὐ πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ὑποθέσεις διακεκριμένον ἑκαστον διελεῖν, ἀλλ' οὕτως εἰκῇ καὶ ὡς ἑκαστον ἐπῆλθεν ἀναγράψαι, ὡς οὐχὶ χαλεπὸν ἔχουσα, φησί, τὸ κατ' εἶδος αὐτὰ διελεῖν, ἐπιτερπέστερον δὲ καὶ χαριέστερον τὸ ἀναμιγμένον καὶ τὴν ποικιλίαν τοῦ μονοειδοῦς νομίζουσα.²⁵ "[She says] that she *distributed all those things* that she considered *worthy of notice* and *memory* in commingled *notes* and not arranged *each according to the particular subjects*, but she recorded them *just* by chance and *as each one* came, *not* because she found it *difficult*, she says, *to distribute* them *according to their kind*, but because she *considered mixture and variety* more delightful and pleasant than *uniformity*." This passage provides the framework for my reconstruction and the words that I have restored in lines 1 and 4. In line 4, Photius seems to have followed his practice of making impersonal the constructions that Pamphila made personal, particularly because

¹⁷ *Bibliotheca*, 26a.2; cf. Procopius, *De Bellis*, II, 19.17.

¹⁸ See A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes* (Brussels, 1935), I, 198–204, 310–15. Since there was no government at Baghdad at any time during the period of Photius' career, the common opinion that his embassy went to Baghdad is indefensible.

¹⁹ C. Mango, "The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photios," in *Iconoclasm*, ed. A. Bryer and J. Herrin (Birmingham, 1977), 135–39.

²⁰ *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire* (London, 1912), 446 note 2.

²¹ ... οἷς συναπαρτίλεισθαί σοι, φίλτατε ἀδελφῶν, ἴσθι καὶ τὴν ποθεινὴν ἐξαίτησιν. E. Martini, "Studien zur Textgeschichte der *Bibliothèque* des Patriarchen Photios von Konstantinopel. I. Der alte Pinax," *Ἑλλ. Φιλολ. Συλλ.*, suppl. to 34 (1921), 318.25–27. This *pinax* is included in both MSS, and ought to be included in editions of the *Bibliotheca*.

²² See T. Hägg, "Photius at Work: Evidence from the Text of the *Bibliotheca*," *GRBS*, 14 (1973), 213–22.

²³ *Bibliotheca*, codex 29, 6a.28 (to codex 31), codex 33, 6b.38–7a.2 (to codex 76), codex 38, 8a.22–25 (to codex 43 = 240), codex 41, 9a.12–15 (to codex 55), codex 58, 17a.24–27 (to codices 91 and 93), codex 60, 19b.36–38 (to codex 70 = 244), codex 61, 20b.12–17 (to codices 159 = 260, 262, and 265) and 23–28 (to codex 158), etc.

²⁴ *De Photi bibliothecae codicibus historicis* (diss. Bonn, 1913), 18–19.

²⁵ *Bibliotheca*, 119b.27–33.

he generally refers to himself in the plural, while νομίζων in line 5 (for her νομίζουσα) is singular. In line 4 I restore her unreduplicated perfect form ἀναμιγμένον (for ἀναμειγμένον), which is comparable to Photius' own ἀπομνημονεῦσθαι (for ἀπομνημονεύσθαι) in line 12. Lines 2 and 3 can be reconstructed from parallels elsewhere in the *Bibliotheca*. For example, Photius criticizes Phlegon of Tralles for "untimely *learning and pedantry* (φιλοπονία καὶ φιλοτιμία) that lead the *reader* (ἀκροατήν) to *boredom* (κόρον)," ²⁶ and Libanius for spoiling some of his orations "through *much learning and officiousness* (πολλῇ . . . φιλοπονίᾳ τε καὶ περιεργίᾳ)." ²⁷ Photius also accuses Theophylact Simocatta of "*officious and excessive pedantry* (φιλοτιμίας . . . περιέργου καὶ περιττῆς)." ²⁸ But in his preface to his *Lexicon* he observes that his own inclusion of poetic words is "nothing *excessive* (περιττόν) or *pedantic* (φιλότιμον)." ²⁹ My completion of line 6 is based on Photius' judgment of the historian Candidus, who "is found *harmonizing* his history *even from the most dissimilar things* (καὶ ἐξ ἀνομοιοτάτων ἁρμόζων)." ³⁰ The completion of line 7 is corroborated by Photius' praise of Dio of Prusa for taking his examples "from *varied* (ποικίλης) material and *harmonizing* (ἁρμολόμενος) them appropriately," ³¹ and his condemnation of an anonymous author who "*in many places and at many times* (ἐν πολλοῖς καὶ πολλάκις) tries to force *disharmonious* (ἀνάρμοστα) words to *harmonize* (ἐφαρ-

μόζειν) with our holy dogmas. . . ." ³² Finally, the completion of line 8 is suggested by Photius' criticisms of Phlegon, cited above, ³³ of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, whose digressions snatch "the *reader* (ἀκροατήν) away from *boredom* (κόρου) with his history," ³⁴ and of Basil of Seleucia, whose "*boringness* (προσκορές) of expression rouses the *reader* (ἀκροατήν) to disgust and aversion. . . ." ³⁵ Even if this reconstruction has gone slightly astray, the sense is certain. ³⁶ Photius liked variety and disliked rigid organization in the works of others. When he composed the *Bibliotheca*, he applied these preferences to his own work, justifying them with some of the words of Pamphila, whose compilation he admired and perhaps saw as a forerunner of his own.

9–10: The τὰ in the margin before line 10 seems to be a conjecture (probably a correct one) made by a later hand after the corner with the end of line 9 was lost.

17: Photius regularly uses the words καὶ τότε in his letters to mean "and especially." ³⁷

20–26: This explains why Photius describes many obscure books at great length, while treating Herodotus and Isocrates rather briefly and leaving out altogether such standard authors as Plato, Thucydides, and Xenophon, whom he had certainly read. ³⁸

³² *Bibliotheca*, 117b.2–4: Οὐ ῥητὰ γὰρ μόνον ἐν πολλοῖς καὶ πολλάκις ἀνάρμοστα τοῖς ἡμετέροις θεοῖς δόγμασιν ἐφαρμόζειν ἐκβιάζεται. . . . The form ἐν πολλοῖς πολλάκις is paralleled at 98a. 15–16.

³³ See note 26 *supra*.

³⁴ *Bibliotheca*, 65a.15–16: . . . τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ περὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν κόρου διαλαμβάνων. . . .

³⁵ *Bibliotheca*, 116a.13–16: Τὸ δὲ λίαν προσκορές τῆς τροπῆς . . . εἰς ἀηδίαν καὶ διαβολὴν τὸν ἀκροατὴν διεγείρει. . . .

³⁶ Cf. Ziegler, in *RE*, 20, 686: "The sense was that, rather than systematic organization, the author preferred an order in varied alternation, which excluded the danger of boredom and satiety in the reader."

³⁷ *Epistolae*, ed. Valettas (note 14 *supra*), 160 and note 2, 290, 291, 527, 533, and 556.

³⁸ See *Bibliotheca*, 8a.7, 100a.21–24, and 165b.20–23 on Plato; 35b.30–32, 64a.17–20, and 171b.9–12 on Thucydides; and 17b.20–21 on Xenophon. In his postface, Photius says explicitly that he is leaving out books "whose study and perusal commonly constitute the arts and sciences" (545.13–14: . . . ὧν ἡ σπουδὴ καὶ μελέτη τέχνας φιλεῖ καὶ ἐπιστήμας ἐργάζεσθαι. . .).

²⁶ *Bibliotheca*, 84a.39–41: . . . περὶ τοὺς χρησμούς ἀκαιρὸς φιλοπονία καὶ φιλοτιμία, εἰς κόρον ἀπάγουσα τὸν ἀκροατὴν. . . .

²⁷ *Bibliotheca*, 67b.14–16: Τῇ γὰρ πολλῇ περὶ τοὺς ἄλλους φιλοπονίᾳ τε καὶ περιεργίᾳ τὴν. . . τοῦ λόγου. . . χάριν ἐλυμήνατο. . . .

²⁸ *Bibliotheca*, 27a.19–20: . . . ἡ τῆς γνωμολογίας οὐκ ἐν καιρῷ παρενθήκη φιλοτιμίας ἐστὶ περιέργου καὶ περιττῆς.

²⁹ *Lexicon* (note 15 *supra*), I, 200: . . . περιττόν οὐδὲν οὐδὲ φιλότιμον. . . .

³⁰ *Bibliotheca*, 55a.28–29: . . . συμμιγῇ τὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ ἐξ ἀνομοιοτάτων ἁρμόζων ἀλίσκεται. Henry mistranslates this whole sentence, which is praise of Candidus, not further blame: "But he, occasionally in his writings becoming altogether much better than himself, is found harmonizing his history even from the most dissimilar things, through commingling."

³¹ *Bibliotheca*, 165b.17–18: . . . ποικίλης ὕλης λαμβάνων αὐτὰ καὶ προσφυῶς ἁρμολόμενος.

32: Here a scribe seems to have omitted several words. I give a sample reconstruction in my apparatus and translation.

30–37: Since the books Photius has left out are only those read by Tarasius in *Photius' hearing* (col. 1, lines 15–16), Photius realizes that Tarasius may have read some of

the other books without him. In general, though Photius probably expected Tarasius to show the *Bibliotheca* to others, its contents tend to confirm that it was a private and informal work, whose statements should not be treated as if they were the result of long and careful research and reflection.